



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
FEBRUARY 2, 2006  
DRAFT REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Wayne Ecton, Council Member  
Jeremy A. Jones, Vice-Chairman  
E.L. Cortez, Design Member  
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member  
Kevin O'Neill, Development Member  
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner

**ABSENT:** Michael Schmitt, Design Member

**STAFF:** Greg Williams  
Mac Cummins  
Monique De Los Rios Urban  
Lusia Galav  
Erin Perreault De Perez

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ecton at 1:06 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

**OPENING STATEMENT**

Councilman Ecton read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

**MINUTE APPROVAL**

1. January 19, 2006 DRB Study Session Minutes
2. January 19, 2006 DRB Regular Session Minutes

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 19, 2006 MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD, INCLUDING THE STUDY SESSION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

4. 75-DR-2005 Casa Del Encanto

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE 75-DR-2005. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

6. 33-DR-2003#2 Main Street Phase II – Courtyard @ Main

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO MOVE 33-DR-2003#2 TO CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0). COUNCILMAN ECTON RECUSED.**

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE 33-DR-2003#2 WITH AMENDED STIPULATIONS. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0). COUNCILMAN ECTON WAS RECUSED.**

**REGULAR AGENDA**

3. 71-DR-2005 Classic Car Spa

Greg Williams addressed the Board, highlighting the intended services to be provided. He noted that City Council had some questions regarding colors during the use permit process and that the Applicant has revised the colors and made changes to the canopies and entries.

Board Member O'Neill asked for clarification on the queuing process. He noted the illustration denoted that queuing started at the car wash entry and suggested that it would be better to start queuing at the canopy. He inquired about the proposed relationship between the oil/lube bays and the queuing line, noting that the elevations show the queuing line blocking the bays.

Mr. Williams requested that Board Member O'Neill hold his questions until the Applicants presentation.

Councilman Ecton noted that there were no cards from the public.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Williams confirmed that photographs of another carwash were included in the packet as an example. He clarified that construction has not begun on this project.

Mr. Rick Stertz, Applicant, addressed the Board. Highlights of the presentation included an explanation of the process of the all hand wash two tunnel system, the four lane entry cue, the vacuuming system, and waiting area plan. He also noted that there will be gas pumps available in front of the convenience store as well as for car wash customers. He remarked that there was a great deal of time spent creating a design to prevent backups. Mr. Stertz noted that color changes were submitted separately from the original materials board. Mr. Stertz explained the process of getting into the oil change bays.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Stertz confirmed that the screen wall will be constructed of eight inch scored split face block.

Commissioner Schwartz reiterated that material samples need to be provided for the Board because not all Members are familiar with architectural materials. Mr. Stertz clarified that the split face sample was included on the original materials board submitted.

Councilman Ecton requested that Staff make it standard procedure to present all material boards each time an Applicant returns to the Development Review Board, noting that there are Members that rotate their seats and may not have been present previously.

Mr. Williams clarified for Commissioner Schwartz that there is a re-vegetation requirement in the Scenic Corridor of a two-inch caliber. He noted that they usually re-vegetate by boxing existing plants on site and replanting. He mentioned that this particular site is included in a master developer site plan so the Applicant is not responsible for vegetation.

Responding to comments by Commissioner Schwartz, suggesting that the minimum size requirements be raised, Mr. Gray summarized that the standards are a balance between survival and maturity. He suggested that staff inquire with the City arborist for a recommendation of what the maximum size could be for survival and return to the DRB with that information for a recommendation. Commissioner Schwartz requested that he be provided with updates even if he is no longer sitting on the Development Review Board.

Mr. Gray confirmed for Board Member D'Andrea that a deceleration lane exists on Scottsdale Road. Board Member D'Andrea requested that the issue be investigated to ensure that cars are not forced into the carwash driveway when trying to make a right-hand turn at the intersection.

Commissioner Schwartz suggested that he would not be willing to approve this project until the Board is provided with information depicting the surrounding approved projects. He opined that how the site will interconnect with surrounding areas should be included in the application.

Referring to an aerial photograph, Mr. Stertz explained the trash collection system. He noted that the infrastructure is already in place.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the Applicant's showing of compatibility with his neighbors. Mr. Stertz argued that they are being forced to go through an

exercise beyond their responsibilities. Commissioner Schwartz reiterated the need to see what has been approved for surrounding businesses, noting that if the Board were provided with that information, many of the questions would be answered. Chairman Ecton agreed, stating that it is the Development Review Board's responsibility to ensure that a new building fits into the neighborhood and with missing pieces, a good judgment cannot be made.

Vice-Chairman Jones summarized that the Board does not have knowledge of the approved colors for the other buildings under construction. He opined that it is a good project, noting that it is the DRB's job to ensure that areas are harmonious. Vice-Chairman Jones clarified that the two things needed are verification that the project will blend with its surroundings and a review of the traffic situation. He remarked that the situation is not the fault of the Applicant and that the project could be approved with a stipulation that the Planning Department takes a look at the traffic flow.

Commissioner Schwartz commented that he has brought up the subject of incomplete packages many times. He reiterated that if complete projects were submitted, a great deal of time could be saved and the Board could make informed decisions instead of debating over things that should have been included in the packets. He stated his intent to make a motion to continue this project and stressed that a criteria for what should be provided in the packages needs to be set before setting any future dates for Applicants to come to the Board.

**COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ MOVED THAT CASE 71-DR-2005 BE CONTINUED TO A FUTURE DATE TO BE BASED UPON WHEN THE APPLICANT CAN GET THE REST OF THE INFORMATION TO STAFF.**

Mr. Stertz argued that their formal application has been submitted for twenty-six weeks and that they provided all of the information requested by the City.

**SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA,**

Councilman Ecton opined that the Board has every right to ask that this project be continued and that it will be up to Staff to decide whose responsibility it is to provide the missing information.

Board Member O'Neill opined that although he agrees that the packages need to be more complete, this Applicant should not be penalized. He noted that he will not support the motion. He recalled that he did not get his questions answered, noting that there were five paint color samples provided and only one matches the site plan. He suggested that the project be approved so that Applicant can move forward with construction, provided they return with additional information.

Vice-Chairman Jones agreed with Board Member O'Neill, opining that it is not reasonable to penalize the Applicant for an incomplete package. He noted that the turn lane issue is the responsibility of the Traffic Department and the color issue can be resolved at a later time.

Commissioner Schwartz reiterated that the master developer does not have any design guidelines and there is no way to know what the other architecture looks like. He further stated that surrounding photographs should be required for applications and that Applicants should be informed enough about their projects to be able to provide information as needed.

**THE MOTION TIED WITH A VOTE OF THREE (3) TO THREE (3). BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL, BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ, AND VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES DISENTED.**

**BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ THEN MOVED FOR THE APPROVAL OF 71-DR-2005 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION THAT THE COLORS RETURN TO THE BOARD FOR REVIEW ALONG WITH A FULL CONTEXTUAL UPDATE OF THE SITE CONTEXT ALONG WITH THE ARCHITECTURE THAT WAS SUBMITTED AS PART OF THE OVERALL MASTER PLAN SITE PLAN,**

Vice-Chairman Jones suggested the addition of a review of the traffic lane turn situation.

Whereupon,  
**BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ MOVED TO INCLUDE A REPORT FROM STAFF REGARDING THE TRAFFIC CONCERN. SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES, THE MOTION TIED WITH A VOTE OF THREE (3) TO THREE (3). BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ, AND COUNCILMAN ECTON DISSENTED.**

Donna Bronski referred to the bylaws regarding how to handle this type of situation.

Mr. Gray suggested that the item be continued for two weeks at which point it would return on consent agenda. He noted that in that time staff would provide the Board with all plans for the context, because context is one of the Development Review Boards responsibilities. He included that Staff would provide all materials board and descriptions, they will take photographs and video of the site, and provide the transportation plans as-built, not as proposed.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL AS STATED BY MR. GRAY. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA,**

In response to inquiry by Board Member O'Neill concerning any added inconvenience to Applicant, Mr. Stertz argued that he has been in the process for a long time and that it has been costly. Councilman Ecton noted that his argument has been heard and asked him to leave the podium. Mr. Gray noted that the majority of the processing time was for a CUP permit and not the DRB process.

Commissioner Schwartz commented that this argument is really a message to Staff to develop a comprehensive, concise list of requirements and avoid presenting applications to the Board until they are complete. He commented that the Board is not making any requests he wouldn't be willing to do himself as an applicant.

**THE MOTION CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ONE (1). BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL DISSENTED.**

5. 92-DR-2005 Big O Tire Store

Mac Cummins addressed the Board, explaining that given the relative importance of projects that will be happening over time in the Revitalization Area along McDowell Road and Scottsdale Road, Staff will place those items on the regular agenda. Highlights of Mr. Cummins presentation included an aerial photo of the site, the proposed site plan, and elevations depicting all sides of the project. He noted that all of the development standard requirements are being met. To address key issues including a concern about noise from the east/west orientation of the service bay doors and comments from neighbors concerned with noise, a stipulation has been added to place a sound wall along the northern property line. Mr. Cummins noted that all projects in this area are being stipulated to comply with the McDowell Road streetscape program. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the added stipulations.

Vice-Chairman Jones opined that the Development Review Board sometimes approves designs of lesser quality for a project that is industrial or associated with a discount service. He noted that it would take little effort or cost to make the building more organized. He suggested shifting the office two to four feet to separate it from the rest of the mass. He also suggested that a break in the height towards the back, where there is a change in the plane, would organize the building more, noting he would like to hear from the project architect about what they could do to improve this.

Mr. Cummins clarified for Board Member D'Andrea that the landscaping along the rear of the building doesn't flow all the way across because the space was needed for cars turning out of the bay area. A discussion ensued regarding shifting of the building in order to make room for more consistency with the landscaping. Mr. Cummins pointed out that they are already at the minimum of twenty-four feet and that the driveway and parking stalls would become too small if the building were shifted. Board Member Cortez noted that the distance is actually at twenty-six feet, which would leave some flexibility.

Board Member O'Neill requested that the Applicant review the operational process. Mr. Cummins clarified that the parapet on the south elevation terminates at the end rather than wrapping around. Board Member O'Neill requested an explanation of the drainage systems and scuppers that appear to be located over the garage doors.

In response to inquiry by Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Cummins explained that there is a stipulation that the Applicant must comply with the perceptual master pedestrian plan which the Transportation Department will review before making their final plan to integrate into the Revitalization Area.

Bill Hunse, Architect, addressed the Board. Addressing the question about shifting the building, he noted that the extra two inches were lost with the addition of landscape installed to soften the vertical transition, which brought the distance

down to the minimum twenty-four feet. He noted that Mr. Cummins was correct in his explanation of the inconsistency of landscaping in the back, verifying that it needed to be open for maneuvering cars. He noted that shifting the building would be impossible because of required handicap parking and ramp allowances.

In response to a question by Board Member O'Neill, Adam Gruender, Owner, explained the operational process. He noted that the service bays are in the back and the tire bays are located in the front of the building and exit through to the rear.

Board Member O'Neill clarified that he was asking whether the drive onto McDowell Road was an entrance or an exit. Mr. Hunse clarified that that drive is only needed for trash pick-up and possibly for use as an exit. Mr. Cummins noted that the Traffic Department has reviewed the project and recommended its approval, however one of the purviews of the Board is site planning. Mr. Cummins confirmed for Councilman Ecton that the Board could stipulate that an exit sign be placed in that drive.

Vice-Chairman Jones presented Mr. Hunse with a sketch.

Board Member Cortez referred back to the question posed by Board Member O'Neill concerning what he thought may be drainage scuppers above the driveway doors. He pointed out that on the exterior elevations schedule those illustrations are indicated as exterior lighting.

Vice-Chairman Jones presented his sketch depicting changes that could be made to the parapet to simplify it, noting that he found the existing parapet breaks to be arbitrary. He suggested that an agreement be reached so that there can be a stipulation added to change the design.

Mr. Hunse clarified that the suggestions were noted as friendly. He described the characterized idea as having harder breaks but being more related to the organization of the plan. He agreed to stipulate the change.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CASE 92-DR-2005, BIG O TIRE STORE, WITH THE CHANGE TO THE PARAPET AS DISCUSSED IN THIS MEETING, BRINGING THE PARAPET CHANGE IN HEIGHT MORE IN RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OTHER BREAKS IN THE BUILDING.**

Commissioner Schwartz noted that he would second the motion if Vice-Chairman Jones added a stipulation that the parapet height be brought to study session for approval.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES ADDED A STIPULATION THAT CONFIRMATION OF THE PARAPET HEIGHT BE BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR CONSENT AGENDA APPROVAL. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ,**

Board Member Cortez clarified that there had been some discussion about adding exterior signage for entry and exit points.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES ADDED A STIPULATION TO ADD SIGNAGE FOR CLARIFICATION OF TRAFFIC.**

Board Member D'Andrea clarified that the parapet change should be brought to study session rather than consent agenda.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES AMENDED THE STIPULATION TO HAVE THE PARAPET CHANGE IN HEIGHT BROUGHT BACK TO STUDY SESSION. MODIFICATIONS WERE SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

Ms. Galav reported that the only date request she received for the retreat was for April 6, requested by Councilman Ecton. With no opposition to that date, she will begin plans for that date, adding that members of the Development Review Board, City Council, and Planning Commission would be invited.

Mr. Gray introduced the new ADA, Denise Le Brach.

Referencing an email received from Donna about the focus of transportation plans, Commissioner Schwartz noted that land uses need to be considered and a redevelopment plan created before any decisions are made.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board adjourned at 2:36.

Respectfully submitted,  
A/V Tronics, Inc.